

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 2016 7:00 P.M.**

Members Present: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Bancroft, Turner, Krieger, Gaugel, Lewis

Members Absent: Bessner

Others Present: Mayor Raymond Rogina; Mark Koenen, City Administrator; Rita Tungare, Director of Community & Economic Development; Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager; Bob Vann, Building & Code Enforcement Division Manager; Matthew O'Rourke, Economic Development Manager; Chris Bong, Development Engineering Division Manager; Chris Minick, Director of Finance

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was convened by Chairman Bancroft at 7:00 P.M.

2. ROLL CALLED

Roll was called:

Present: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Bancroft, Turner, Gaugel, Krieger, Lewis

Absent: Bessner

3. Motion to approve Ald. Lemke to attend this meeting via telephone due to a personal illness.

Motion made by Aldr. Turner to approve Aldr. Lemke attending this meeting via telephone due to personal illness. Seconded by Aldr. Stellato.

Roll was called:

Present: Lewis, Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Gaugel, Krieger

Absent: Bessner

Nays:

Abstain:

Motion Carried 8-0

4. COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

a. Presentation of a Concept Plan for Prairie Center.

Chairman Bancroft gave an introduction stating that the agenda item is before Committee tonight is for Concept Plan review and the purpose and focus of that is set forth in Municipal Code Section 17.04.140. He said he would quote from the Municipal Code so everyone had a very clear understanding of what the subject matter of the meeting was: "The purpose of the Concept Plan review is to enable the applicant to obtain informal input from the Committee prior to spending considerable time and expense in the preparation of detailed plans and architectural drawings. It also serves as a forum for owners of neighboring property to ask questions and express their

concerns and views regarding the potential development.” He said at this point there is no formal application pending and there will be no vote by Committee; rather this code section is drafted to provide a framework for good faith collaborative conversation on the part of all stakeholders in the development effort which includes:

- Owner/developer-who is the party asking for input and has the largest financial interest.
- City officials-who are charged with the ultimate authority for policy questions.
- City staff-where the yeoman’s work and heavy lifting is done to see that everyone is successful in their efforts.
- Members of the public-who are constituents and clients to all of us and to be truly successful a development must be embraced by the public.

He said all 4 of those stakeholders have an aesthetic, community and a financial interest in this development to varying degrees; all 3 of those interests will need to be addressed and that can only be done if we all work on this together.

He then noted how effective the Plan Commission was last Tuesday; he felt it was very constructive and he feels every member expressed encouragement that a Concept Plan was submitted for input and he too is encouraged and he hopes everyone has reviewed the staff memo of the Plan Commission comments which were posted with the materials. He said there is one specific statement in that memo that needs to be highlighted “the project needs to be a catalyst for the area and create a strong sense of place and identity” and he thinks that captures the perspective everyone should keep in mind as we go through tonight meeting.

Chairman Bancroft then shared the process for tonight’s meeting:

- Developer will begin with a presentation about the project concept.
- Committee will then have the opportunity to ask questions regarding the proposals.
- Public will be invited and have the opportunity to ask questions and offer comments regarding the proposal.
- Finally, he would poll the Committee members pointing them in the direction of the staff questions listed in the materials as a background and ask each member to advise the developer as to his or her views on the Concept Plan.

He said with respect to comments to please keep in mind that Concept Plans are not intended to include information regarding; right of ways, plat information such as easements, utilities, traffic and related technical data. He said that information is important, however that will be evaluated at a different stage in the process which is not germane to this meeting; it is important to stay on task with the intended purpose of the Concept Plan that was previously stated. He said a Concept Plan review is not meant to be confrontational and he suggested that comments be focused on what the individual would like to see in the plan and spend less time pointing out their perception of its deficiencies. He said it is also not appropriate to present one’s own alternative plan, as the purpose of the Concept Plan review is clear that we are here to review the plans being presented by the developer and comments should be given within the context of the developer’s plans.

He said as he prepared the previously stated introductory comments and as we go through this process, he thought of 5 “C’s”; Collaborative Constructive Conversation is going to avoid Confrontation; which he believes will result in a Catalyst for this area.

Peter Bazos-Attorney representing the owner and developer-Elgin, IL-said he was there with the Dave Patzelt-President of Shodeen and Donald McKay-Project Architect of Nagle Hartray.

Donald McKay-Principal with Nagle Hartray Architecture-gave a brief history of who Nagle Hartray is:

- Firm founded in 1966-celebrating 50 years
- Good reputation in the Chicago area-AIA Chicago Firm Award Winner (2009)
- Medium-sized firm by design.
- Extensive portfolio in private and public sector architecture including similar housing developments (Dodson Place-Geneva, Fox Rive condominiums and residences in Mill Creek) village halls and public libraries in areas like Oak Park, Evanston and DeKalb.

Mr. McKay said his presentation is divided into 3 parts: context, development options and a comparative analysis of the development options.

Mr. McKay said the site is a little less than 28 acres bordered by Prairie St. and Lincoln Hwy. to the south and just a bit east of Randall Rd. The underlying zoning is currently BR-Regional Business with regional business uses adjacent to it to the south and southeast; it also has RM3-Multi-family use to the north east and then BC-Community Business (Jewel) to the west. He said in talking about context on a project, the history here is unusually important; beginning in 1996 with the closing of St. Charles Mall and followed in 2000 by the establishment of the TIF district and most recently in 2010 the Plan Commission recommended approval of a Towne Centre plan proposed by Shodeen which was then rejected by the City Council.

Mr. McKay said there has been a lot of work done since 2010; he then showed some slides that were not presented at the Plan Commission meeting last week and were added in response to comments heard. He said since 2010 there was:

- Big box retail concept study done.
- Round table with Mid America Development (a national developer who specializes in commercial and retail developments) and a couple of comments that they think are very relevant include: “not Randall Rd.” and with a site like this there “needs to be a reason”, and the Towne Centre provided that reason to be.
- 2011: Shodeen executed a listing agreement with Marco Real Estate Corp.
- 2011-2015: Listing agreement with Summers Commercial Real Estate.
- 2011-2014: Listing agreement with Arcore Real Estate Group-solicited 51 retailers, 4,000 to 140,000 sq. ft., with no interest.

Mr. McKay said there have been numerous attempts to try to market and advertise the current site and a few concepts have been developed, some of which were presented in public at the community meeting and some of which died before they got to that point, those include:

- Big-box retail-no market for it.
- Lifetime Fitness-decided site was not appropriate for what they were looking for.
- Nascar Car Wash-brought to City staff and was mutually decided there were higher and better uses for the site.
- Combining the carwash and health club on the same site.
- Pinetree Development Concept-retail and commercial-were unsuccessful in getting leases for the space-Pinetree backed out.
- CMAP Homes for Changing Region
 - Adopted by St. Charles in 2014

- Based on a breakdown of projected future owners and renters in St. Charles, much of these additional units will be for denser unit types.
 - There will be demand for 1,718 multifamily units between now and 2040.
- 2013-Community Workshop-Homes for a Changing Region-this site was 1 of 5 areas explored and part of the conclusion was that single-family and/or multifamily residential uses are incorporated on each site, with landscape buffering between the residential uses and mixed-use/commercial structures fronting Route 38, where applicable.
- Transit Factors
 - Bus rapid transit (BRT) along Randall Rd. –mutually supportive relationship between land use, transit service, quality and transit accessibility. Density is the primary factor in transit ridership. Increases in residential and employment density with a diversity of land uses and housing types expand BRT’s ridership base and support the local retail market.

Mr. McKay said in summary, there is really little market demand for commercial and retail at this site; several brokerage firms have been unsuccessful in trying to develop either big box or other retail interest; a lack of Randall Rd. frontage precludes potential retailers. He said 1 issue cited in the Plan Commission meeting was a reference to the Comprehensive Plan and to the retail gap study, which seems to show leakage with certain retail in the Randall Rd. market area. He said what is not clear from the Comprehensive Plan is whether the Randall Rd. market area includes property that does not have frontage onto Randall Rd., and he thinks what the developer has found in trying to engage directly with potential real estate firms and developers, is that the frontage on Randall Rd. is a big distinguishing factor. He said he thinks that may be one of the explanations for a possible discrepancy between what the developers find in the market place and what’s indicated in the Comprehensive Plan; but at the time we think that some of the housing and transit studies that have been done reinforce some of the ideas that the developer has for developing this site and do identify a future need and benefit from multi-family housing. He said in some ways the problem was summarized well in the Comprehensive Plan which states that the citizenry is split on the appropriate uses for the 30 acre former St. Charles Mall site and what is desired by many residents may not be economically feasible, which is likely the primary reason the site remains vacant.

Mr. McKay then showed 3 different development options that respond to market conditions and stated that the last plan he would present, Plan #1-PUD plan, would vary most from the adjacent uses, but they feel it is the preferred plan:

- Plan #3-Rezoning Plan without mixed use-This option most closely aligns with the adjacent land uses around the subject site and includes RM3 zoning and the BR zoning along Lincoln Hwy. The RM3 multi-family housing would be located adjacent to the RM3 zoning of the constructed project to the northeast and north of the site. He said there would be a series of outlot uses that would most likely be restaurant uses and the remainder of the site would be for walk-up residential.
 - Residential-433 units
 - Retail-none
 - Restaurant-21,300 sq. ft.
 - Parking-903 spaces

Mr. McKay said it was worth looking at the site plan and pointing out the amount of surface parking on the lot as well as the type of residential that would be included which would be walk-up buildings that meet the RM3 zoning classification.

- Plan #2-Rezoning plan with mixed use-its categorized as CBD-1 only because in looking through the available zoning district options in the current code, this is the one most closely aligned with what the developer is proposing. This plan is similar to the plan #3 except that between the multi-family housing and the outlots along Lincoln Hwy. there would be a strip of mixed use development that includes retail on the first floor and 3 stories of residential on the floors above that. The residential portion would be elevator buildings with below grade parking with residential on the first floor, and the remainder of the site would be the same walk-up type residential mentioned in plan #3. He said there is a large amount of surface parking due to the walkup residential on the site.
 - Residential-454 units
 - Retail-46,800 Sq. ft.
 - Restaurant-21,300 sq. ft.
 - Parking-1,194 spaces
- Plan #1-PUD Overlay that would be based on underlying zoning that includes BR, CBD-1 and RM-3; this is the preferred development option. This plan is similar to plan #2 in the outlots being along Lincoln Hwy. and then a strip of mixed use as well as housing which would be 3 stories over below grade parking. He said the housing is designed and constructed to have 1 parking space in the below grade garage for every unit of housing above; there are no walkups and the all residential is in elevator buildings. He said one of the benefits of this plan is there is much less surface parking; the surface parking around the residential units is for visitors and the remainder of the surface parking would serve the retail uses.
 - Residential-609 units
 - Retail-54,600 sq. ft.
 - Restaurant-21,300
 - Parking-1,279 spaces

Mr. McKay then went through a comparative analysis of the 3 options beginning with zoning metrics and density under the Ordinance, which is based on an underlying zoning of RM-3 which allows for 20 Units per acre. The density for the 3 presented plans are as follows:

- Plan #3-rezoning without mixed use-15.6 units per acre.
- Plan #2-rezoning with mixed use-16.4 units per acre.
- Plan #1-PUD plan-22 units per acre.

Building height under the same usage that is allowed is 50 ft.

- Plan #3-rezoning without mixed use-48 ft. -3 stories tall.
- Plan #2-rezoning with mixed use-60 ft.-4 stories
- Plan #1-PUD plan-60 ft.-4 stories.

Mr. McKay said for the mixed use portions there would be a single floor of retail and 3 floors of residential above that which accounts for the 4 stories.

Mr. McKay then shared the comparisons of the program:

- Plan #3-rezoning without mixed use
 - 433 units
 - No retail
 - Restaurant-21,300 sq. ft.
- Plan #2-rezoning with mixed use
 - 454 units
 - 68,000 sq. ft.-retail
 - Restaurant-21,300 sq. ft.
- Plan #1-PUD plan
 - 609 units
 - 54,600 sq. ft.-retail
 - Restaurant-21,300 sq. ft.

Mr. McKay said plan #1-PUD Plan-has the same amount of open space as the rezoning plans despite the higher density and the increase in commercial space because it has substantially less paved area dedicated to parking and roads.

Mr. Kay summarized information on parking:

- Plan #3-rezoning without mixed use
 - 903 total
 - 806 surface
 - 97 surface garage- He pointed out that in thinking about the architectural character of the development, it would be essentially a series of garage doors at the first floor of the residential units.
- Plan #2-rezoning with mixed use
 - 1,194 total
 - 994 surface
 - 62 surface garage
 - 138 below grade garage- specific to the mixed use portion of the development.
- Plan #1-PUD plan
 - 1,280 total
 - 670 surface- all dedicated to serving the retail/restaurant/visitor parking for residential.
 - 609 below grade garage- majority of residential parking.

Mr. McKay said it was a bit premature to talk about the architectural design but based on other projects the developer was able to show some examples to the Committee. He said the architecture for the PUD plan will rent for a higher rate because they will be constructed to a higher degree of quality in order to support the higher rental rates.

Mr. McKay explained why the developer feels that Plan#1-PUD Plan is a better fit for the community than the rezoning plans:

- More upscale residential product
 - Higher rent & construction cost
 - Better finishes inside and out
 - Elevator versus walk-up building
 - Indoor parking
- Less surface parking, more landscaping
- More commercial space
- More pedestrian-friendly and neighborhood-like
- Higher equalized assessed value generates more property tax revenue
- Will attract fewer family tenants resulting in less impact of schools
- Will attract empty nesters interested in elevator access

A video prepared by Shodeen of the proposed project was shown.

Mr. Bazos noted that because this property is in a TIF district, which expires in several more years, the sooner this property gets developed the sooner the city will recover some of its investment in the demolition of the building which took place many years ago. He said they believe that all 3 plans substantially conform to the Comprehensive Plan for what he feels everyone will agree, is a very challenging site because it's not quite on Randall Rd. and not quite in a solid residential neighborhood either. He said the base concept for Plan #3 is not really the developer's first choice but it is consistent with adjacent zoning and doesn't seek any departures. He said the developer strongly prefers to do plan #1 for the PUD, with plan #2 being the fallback. He said if none of those are acceptable, the developer would have to pursue the straight zoning, which is not their first choice. He said the developer has had numerous meetings with staff and 2 neighborhood meetings and at this point are looking forward to the Committee's input and will take careful notes.

Aldr. Krieger asked if they had given any thought to include senior housing. Mr. McKay said yes and he thinks the way Shodeen would go about that would be to phase it and to include a portion of the site that could respond to senior housing if there were a demand for that. The developer is open to that and he thinks it's a market area that has not been explored thoroughly yet; but they have heard that in public comments and the developer is open to that possibility. He said the developer is fairly sure though that the entire site could not be senior housing, just a portion.

Aldr. Gaugel asked what the anticipated rents are between the different plans. Mr. McKay said \$1.50 per sq. ft. versus \$1.30 per sq. ft.; depending on how you calculate that, a 25% difference for a 1,000 sq. ft. unit. Aldr. Gaugel asked if the actual size of the units themselves from plans #2 and #3 vs. plan #1 (PUD) would be approximately the same in terms of square footage. Mr. McKay said the size of the units and the unit mix would probably be similar but he thinks with the walk-up units would be likely to attract more families the units might be slightly different. Aldr. Gaugel said so the occupancy on the fewer unit plans opposed to the PUD plan could very well be the same occupancy or close to it in the PUD plan with families occupying 2 of the smaller plans opposed to the larger plan which is geared more toward professionals, elderly, empty nesters or people without kids or families. Mr. McKay said yes, that's fair.

Aldr. Lewis said there would still be a considerable amount of cars parked in the surface parking for the PUD plan. Mr. McKay said yes, associated with the outlots along Lincoln Hwy. but he thinks if we are trying to create a residential neighborhood, with a site this size, there is a real opportunity to create a new residential neighborhood and to create a character that we think is

consistent with what has been heard in public meetings. He said it will be easier to do if we have to deal with fewer cars in the residential portion. He said cars associated with the retail have to be there to support the retail which is important for the success of the retail; but they are focused on that environment as it relates specifically to the residential portion. Aldr. Lewis asked if they anticipate where the restaurants will be and if they will be leaving the 2 existing ones or demolishing those and building new. Mr. McKay said the east restaurant building would be demolished and the one to the west could remain. Aldr. Lewis said so the former Colonial would remain and former Burger King would not. She said she hears all this talk about the empty nesters and seniors, a group which she is a part of, and wonders what would make her want to live there, because it's going to take more than elevators to get active seniors to live in a community like this; what is their draw or catalyst to make people choose this place versus other places in Geneva or Mill Creek. Mr. McKay said he thinks there would be a number of reasons to choose St. Charles, whether its family in the area or they are familiar with it, but he feels that one of the draws needs to be that it feels like you live in a neighborhood, and he thinks that's an important part of the Concept Plan that is probably not fully worked out yet, but can be as the plan is developed. Aldr. Lewis said she doesn't feel a sense of community in the drawings presented. Mr. McKay said this is the first test to see how the buildings can fit on the site and he thinks especially with the mixed use that's being proposed and the first floor retail also, it lends itself to that neighborhood feel with good relationships between the residents and the retail; but he sees how it can be hard to read that into this plan at this point.

Aldr. Turner-No questions.

Aldr. Payleitner asked why they presented 3 plans. Mr. McKay said it's a bit of retracing the history; at the 2 neighborhood meetings we only presented 2 plans-the PUD plan and the mixed use in the center plan. He said the developer has unsuccessfully tried to develop this property in the past and he thinks these initial meetings are somewhat exploratory to figure out what can be successful here from both the developer and the community's point of view. He said the third plan that was added after the neighborhood meeting was really in direct response to comments heard in terms of "less dense" and "didn't vary as much from the adjacent zoning". Mr. Bazos added that the property has remained vacant under current ownership for many years and is becoming a terrible financial drain on the owners and frankly they just cannot have it go on any longer. He said they are trying to present the PUD plan which they think is great, and would like to know what the Committee thinks, but at the end of the day, plan #3, they feel, that is the owner's minimum right by law it has, and they cannot come out of this empty handed. Aldr. Payleitner said her question was answered, and that the former Towne Centre project preceded her time on Council, but she wanted the 2010 conversation to continue, and she was just curious as to why the 3 plans were presented. She said in regard to the senior living, she was part of the CMAP group and she thinks the city is behind with inventory for residential, but we are behind the eight ball when it comes to senior housing and she would like to continue that conversation for sure.

Aldr. Silkaitis said if this were hypothetically approved with the PUD plan what would be the build out time and what would be built first. Mr. McKay said it would be a phased development with a total build out time of 5-7 years and he feels that one of the things we are talking about today regarding the phasing is specifically related to the question of retail. He said there seems to be this gap between what the community thinks this site will support and what the developer thinks they have learned in trying to get retail on this site. He said one way to narrow that gap and understanding is to build some retail on the site and see how that leases up; if it does well that's an

indication that there is demand on the site and a good indication that it would be successful in building more retail on the site. He said if there is great difficulty in leasing a little bit of retail on the site or some portion of retail on the site, that's probably an indicator for future retail as well. He said he thinks the 5-7 year build out is something that would be worked out as the plan is developed and part of it may be a strategy trying to figure out what the best mix is. He said the subject of senior housing came up earlier as well and that may factor into that same type of phased development thinking as well. Aldr. Silkaitis said the reason he asks that question is because a development in town was approved almost 4 years ago and nothing has been built on it yet, and he is concerned that this will drag on for 10 years and he wonders what their plan is; what the first building built will be, retail or residential. Mr. Patzelt said that's really market-driven. Mr. McKay said we are presenting a plan here that they think is supported by what the developer has learned in the market place over the course of the last 4-5 years. He said given their track record with development they know something about what is going to work on this and it's also important to understand that there is a financial incentive to move forward with this and to not delay this any longer. He said one reason they are presenting 3 plans is because the developer plans to do something now; whether it's the PUD plan or something else, they cannot afford to sit on the property and let it linger longer. Aldr. Silkaitis said he knows, it's been 15 years since this started and he wants something built there too.

Aldr. Silkaitis asked Mr. Minick to explain how the TIF would work if it is residential and what would be the impact. Mr. Minick-finance director-said we are pretty early on in the game and have not yet been in the position to develop a lot of numbers, but as the committee well knows the General Fund is currently subsidizing the operations of this particular TIF district and to date that amount is \$936,000 and they anticipate that will increase to about \$1,030,000 by the end of the 2016 fiscal year. He said currently the base EAV of the property is essentially the value of the land since it does not contain any buildings; therefore any type of building activity would have a positive substantial impact on the financial results of the TIF. Aldr. Silkaitis said he didn't expect there to be numbers yet but he is curious how it would affect the TIF. Mr. Minick said it would have a substantial positive impact on the finances of the TIF district, even if its residential, any type of building activity out there would generate increment which is how we retire the debt related to the TIF district. Also in terms of the specific dates of the TIF district, this particular one was established in 2000, the last tax levy that will be eligible for TIF revenue under the current TIF district will be by levy year 2023, which the city will receive during calendar year 2024 due to the year delay between the levy and collecting taxes. Aldr. Silkaitis asked which would generate more money- commercial/retail or residential. Mr. Minick said he thinks it will depend on the mix, but probably on a per square foot basis, it would be the residential due to the higher finishes it tends to have a little more value in some analysis he has seen, but it does depend on the type and character of the development itself.

Aldr. Stellato said in regard to variances, he understands the use of the PUD giving the developer some leeway into laying out a plan, and this is early on so he realizes this Concept Plan is not finalized, but a PUD also gives the city some control and also help to layout the plan including landscaping etc. He said so far he sees 2 variances- building height and density dwelling units per acre, and he asked what else they anticipate based on this PUD. Mr. McKay said the fact that it's early on, he thinks the staff report identified a couple other variances related to setbacks. Aldr. Stellato said right, so if this plan starts to change, have they looked to see if they can accommodate setbacks or is that a rock hard variance. Mr. McKay said they have not looked at that yet. Aldr. Stellato commented in regard to the community atmosphere and spirit, and he assumes there would

be a clubhouse, but if there ends up being a senior component to the development, they would need more of an activity center; so there could not be a club house and an activity center together, he doubts the two would mix. He said in trying to identify what the site plan and development is, but if it has a senior component, he would expect it to be in a certain portion of the development with an activity center and a club house separate for the younger generation.

Chairman Bancroft asked what the focus of the development is, and him being in the rental business himself, they are now experiencing on the development side “the amenity war”. He said in the mid 2000’s it was an amenity war for condos and everybody had to have a pool, workout room and a nice community center and now apartment buildings are going down that same path and he asked if they have a focus of a target market right now. Mr. Patzelt said their intent with the 609 units is to target the entire spectrum and be able to cater to different eggs in different baskets. As an example, a young recent college grad from the St. Charles area wants to live back in the community but wants to live in a non-walk up or secure environment- this product could provide that; same with an empty nester or a divorcee. He said it is intended to be a neighborhood of buildings and not to say that the building on the far east and far west are all one type of residents, but if seniors were targeted for a specific area, he doesn’t see a campus of 609 senior families being able to meet that market. The buildings laid out in the plan consist of anywhere from 30-45 units per building and senior living facilities typically want to be in the 70-200 unit range; so to perhaps put a reservation on some of these 609 units for seniors they would need some flexibility in the plan to take 2 or 3 of these building and connect them to have the 60-200 units. He said within that connected building, that’s where you would see that senior hobby room/art room/piano room/hair salon; he doesn’t see those seniors going down to participate in the clubhouse with the 20-30 year olds.

Aldr. Lemke asked if there would be any of the 3 story walk ups available for seniors or empty nesters. Mr. Patzelt said in plans #3 or #2, no they would not be making reservation of a certain number of units for seniors, typically in the walk up product they develop and manage, those do not cater well to seniors. Aldr. Lemke asked if they are 3 or 4 story. Mr. Patzelt said 3. Aldr. Lemke said he would need to speak to staff members to see how much of that type of housing is well accepted here.

Kathy Brens-1109 Prairie St.-said she and her late husband moved back to St. Charles in 1976 and have certainly seen a lot of changes along the Prairie St. area since. She said she fought to the bitter end against the Prairie St. bridge because of the potential of increased traffic; having said that, she got used to it and uses it every day. That being said she is not thrilled with the idea of major construction going on just a few block from her home but at the same time she feels it is critically important that we as citizens, the government and Shodeen get together so that whatever project we end up with can become an economic asset and stop being such a burden on the property owners and the city.

Kim Malay-526 S. 16th St.-said as noted in the Plan Commission transcripts, this plan doesn’t really meet any of the 3 alternatives in the Comprehensive Plan and part of that is because its way off balance; it’s not the mix that they are talking about. She said it also doesn’t meet a couple other areas and she then quoted content of the Comprehensive Plan to give thoughts about where we can improve this plan. She said we talk about about how Randall Rd. in the Comprehensive Plan is considered a regional commercial corridor and it is a gateway, and in the Comprehensive Plan it talks about how important it is to make sure that we get a good quality development that

does have a sense of community and place. She understands there has to be a compromise and something needs to happen, but we need to be sure it looks like it belongs in this area in the city; it needs to be a crown jewel in our gateway. She said all 3 plans are apartment complexes without a sense of community and she recommends we all sit down to look at how these plans can be improved to have a better mix. She also encourages the city to have a diversity study, economic study, feasibility study and a market analysis study done on this property and it needs to be an independent study, something that is up to date and current so we know what we are looking for and what we need. She also encouraged getting a study done of the entire area because it might be cost effective to do it that way, but she realizes we are discussing this property right now, but she does encourage the city to go above and beyond at some point with that as well. She said one reason she feels this site has been tough to develop with commercial is because none of the properties around it are anything special either; they are all blighted and have a tough time and when people come in to look at this site they look at what is going on and there is no plan in place for the future, so they are hesitant about what to invest in. She said in terms of providing a balance of users in mixed uses, it is important to maintain a healthy balance, consider implications of concentrating units in one area of the city; the west side alone has 1,600 units and there is 800 on the east side so obviously the balance is very skewed to one side. She said in the Comprehensive Plan section for this area, it talks about possibly relocating Jewel to put the commercial on the Randall frontage side and play off of that, and maybe that should be looked at as a possible redevelopment for the site. She's not saying don't put any residential on the site, but rather a mix and let's look at some options for the site to make it more successful. She said in talking about the sense of community: the importance of fostering an active and interesting district; should be safe, attractive and walkable; new developments should be a representative of local character; encourage compatible and high quality design and construction with emphasis on site design building orientation, architecture, building materials and site improvements; amplify the sense of place is what we are calling for. She said the walkability is huge and we don't really have that in this plan and all of these things that Committee has talked about she is grateful for in terms of having the amenities for those tenants but there is a long way to go on this.

Larry Norgard-1214 S. 16th St.-He agrees with Ms. Malay entirely and himself as a senior citizen or someone just out of college who needs a roommate or has a significant other would not have any less than 2 cars to commute to work and couldn't live there. This is a complex, not a community; it's not a comfortable place to live in any respect.

Brian LaVolpe-1219 Dean St.-said in regard to community wanted for the PUD plan, of the 609 units, which will be affordable housing for single mothers or kids coming out of school. Ms. Tungare said that currently the city's affordable housing ordinance is suspended and the City Council is considering amendments to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and is yet to be voted on by Council. She said as Mr. Patzelt indicated it is unknown whether they will be required to provide any affordable housing. Mr. LaVolpe said this wouldn't be a sense of community then; it would be maybe just exclusive to a certain group. Mr. Patzelt asked if in saying a "certain group" you are referring to economic class. Mr. LaVolpe said yes, certain people can only afford to live there and in talking about a sense of community, there would be single fathers and mothers with children and this doesn't seem like it fits that mold with the amenities being offered and the amount it would cost them. Mr. Patzelt said at this point in the planning, they are not planning or putting in any affordable units; but there could be an ordinance that comes along by the time this project is approved that would require them to have a certain number of affordable units. But right now they are not planning for any of these to be required to be or desired to be affordable units.

Mr. LaVolpe said that's the key word "desired to be". Mr. Patzelt said at this point in time, correct. Mr. LaVolpe said so they are not planning on a sense of community; the desire is a certain level of people to live in these units. Mr. Patzelt said they are looking for market-rate housing and a sense of community that could be large units, small units, senior living units, un-age restricted as well as "for sale" units. Mr. LaVolpe asked if they would be all 2-bedroom type units. Mr. Patzelt said no it would not; there would be very few studios but mainly 1 and 2 bedroom type units. Mr. LaVolpe said that's what he wasn't understanding it sounded like they were all 2 bedrooms.

Tavia Tawney-1242 S. 11th St.-said in listening to some of the plans she has some concerns with the parking especially if the PUD plan goes forward, many people have significant others, adult children living with them and 1 parking place per unit with the sublevel parking is a recipe for a potential issue down the line. She said she can easily see that becoming a fight for parking by the restaurants and retail. She said she has seen this happen in other locations she has lived and has gone forward before those boards several times regarding these same issues because she doesn't feel this is sufficient parking if the PUD plan goes forward. She also feels it doesn't feel like a sense of community and she thinks of some of the recent high end developments and thinks "what would draw her or her parents there" and she doesn't see that here. She said she thinks of Serosun Farms-luxury estate living with sustainability, and she doesn't see that here; what would draw a millennial here versus Oak Park, she doesn't see that here; and things like that need to be considered as to what type of person or groups would be moving in here and how would they be drawn in and what makes it different from surrounding communities. She said in looking at downtown Wheaton, there are downtown stores and running paths, and this development will be facing a Salvation Army which doesn't really feel like a community to her. She said in terms of retail she has a concern because there are a tremendous amount of vacancies in commercial locations in St. Charles and wondered if these retail spots would turn to a nail salon-which we have plenty of-or a sandwich shop- which will take business away from another spot creating another vacancy in another part. She said she understands the benefits of mixed use and providing a place to grab something to eat, but these are all things that she is concerned about. She is also concerned about run-off issues; the PUD plan does have the least amount of hard surface area; however they are experiencing run-off issues on this side of St. Charles in the Davis School area and her concern there is that anything there would also continue entering into their plumbing system which already has problems. She said she would like to see housing available for people with disabilities; it would be really nice to have some portions set aside for seniors; her parents are active seniors in their 70's and she doesn't see them wanting to be segregated into a far corner of the property. She said also just additional green issues; looking at sustainability and ways to reduce the environmental impact that this development will have on our area as well as the selling points to millennials is very important.

Craig Bobowiec-508 Cedar St.-said he would like to encourage as this progresses to always keep in mind the Jewel and Benny's parcel because if this is built out as a larger residential community and those 2 business sites go out of business; he wants to be sure that something is in place that this residential thing doesn't keep continuously keep growing over the other parcels on the property; that we somehow protect those to stay commercial forever. He said don't forgot about the contiguous pieces around it that are still owned by the same developer.

Vanessa Bell- Lasota-1610 Howard St.-said she is encouraged by remarks by council and also by Plan Commission. She said she was at the workshop where the city hired attorneys to lead the discussion and she would encourage the city to see all that input because she has not seen it

published anywhere and a lot of the suggestions received tonight and at Plan Commission were suggested at the workshop as well. There were some excellent ideas for reorienting the buildings for access from Randall Rd. and she would hate for that to be lost in all of this and she encourages those notes to be looked at from the attorneys that conducted those sessions.

Ms. Malay asked who would be covering the improvement costs as far as sewer and storm. Chairman Bancroft said he thinks that goes a little beyond the Concept Plan review at the moment, but he does agree with the comment, those will be details that will need to be fleshed out with maybe an economic analysis.

John Rabchuk-914 Ash St.-said he is on the board of directors for the National Ready Mix Concrete Assoc. and they track the housing industry very tightly because there is almost a 1 to 1 relationship and there are some trends in housing that he feels are important to note and are different than what he grew up with substantially. 1-demand for housing right now is 75% multifamily, not single-family cornfield subdivision etc., which cannot exist in St. Charles anymore as we do not have that kind of land. 2-the demand is for multi-family housing with no maintenance or maintenance fees which is empty nesters or people not getting married until they are 32-34 years old. 3-less than 30% of households in America have children, so they don't want yards or 3 cars in the driveway. So if we are going to build something that people want, then the demand is going to be this or a variation of this, and certainly St. Charles needs more rooftops because we are hurting in a number of ways; retail in particular as well as the schools. He said we need more rooftops, and what the public wants based on all the surveys his association has done is multi-family housing and he thinks the retail here on the first floor could be supported to a large extent (like Dodson Place) by 60% of those local residents with walkability.

Chairman Bancroft went back to the Committee members to address questions raised in the Staff Memo regarding the Comprehensive Plan, land use, site design layout and mixed use zoning. He said it would be a good way to frame the committee's input for the developer and concluding remarks.

Aldr. Krieger said she would like to see more diversity in the design; it seems a little cookie cutter right now, but she understands the developer wants to know where they are going before they put the money into that. She is concerned somewhat by the 1 parking space per unit but there again perhaps that can be addressed in the future, and she would like to see some senior living and a lot of landscaping.

Aldr. Gaugel said 4 years ago he leaned toward retail on this site and his decision has definitely changed; he's not an expert on what the land use is or what the studies provide, but he trusts staff and the committee on that. If the market is calling for this multi-family, and we as a committee have heard that time and time again, that is not an issue for him. He said in looking through the Concept Plans the first 2 plans which are in the mid-400 unit range; in his opinion he would not prefer those over the PUD plan, but the parking issue does concern him and it would also be nice to see the density brought down to not be an exception without decreasing that parking; he thinks that might solve a couple problems right there. He said having been on the Comprehensive Plan Task Force, those 3 options were left open for a purpose; they weren't set in stone when discussed and it was very difficult to decide at that time how many options there should be because they wanted somewhat of an open interpretation so thoughts could be brought back to the Plan Commission as well as Council, and he thinks it accomplishes that and he would have no problem

considering an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. He said the site design and layout is very difficult for him to visualize and in showing us the development at Rt. 25 and Rt. 38 and to him that is not ideal for this site; he would like to see something with more architectural detail or even more landscaping. The plan as presented seems very sterile to him but maybe it's just his difficulty in envisioning what they have out there for the future; other than that he thinks they have groundwork with a lot of considerations from residents, staff and Committee, and he thinks we can all work together and hopefully come to a good conclusion to get this project moving.

Aldr. Lewis said this plan has been gone over several times and what she has heard from the beginning about a year ago and it hasn't changed much, the comments are staying consistent. Everyone prefers the PUD plan; so how do we get that plan to fit both your needs and our vision. She said she thinks we are consistent when we say we want the mix different with more retail less residential; it's 80/20 now and she would like to see those numbers get closer. She said she likes the underground parking, the quality, the look and the feel of it needs to be upscale as well; she's not sure what that is, but sometimes you know it when you see it, and she thinks once that is presented to us we will all say yes, that's it. She said we are not quite there yet but she thinks we can get there. She would definitely require a full total market study, traffic study, study the need for the apartments and a visual impact study. She's okay with the mixed use as long as it's less residential and more retail/commercial; mixed use is intended to complement each other to be a place where you can live, work and shop and she doesn't think this plan provides that; she thinks it provides retirement or just an apartment complex. She said even retired people have grandchildren come and visit and where would they be able to go outside and play; she doesn't see a place where she could come down from her 3rd floor and go outside in a community space without being in the far corner and to her it should be more centrally located for people. She said more pedestrian and bike friendly, more landscaping buffers, green initiatives for younger people, running paths, are all things she would like to see and she hopes they come back with these suggestions incorporated into it and not these plans again so we can move forward. She quoted Plan Commission Chairman Wallace – In 10 years from now we want Prairie Center to be on the cover of all the developers' publications to say "this is what you can do too".

Aldr. Turner said he prefers the PUD option and if we have to amend the Comprehensive Plan, so be it, and he hopes something can get done on this and if they come back and they cannot build this, he will not stand in their way if they want to build the other 2 plans.

Aldr. Payleitner also clearly like the PUD and she would like to see this place be "a reason to be" and she thinks there is potential and we can get there.

Aldr. Silkaitis said in the beginning he was always in favor of strictly commercial/retail, but there are a lot of vacant store fronts in the city and we are in trouble filling those but he would like to see a little more effort on a bit more retail/commercial. He said he doesn't expect a 50/50 split but this is compromise and he hopes we can work this out to get this built out in his lifetime and he thinks everyone needs to work together. He said nothing against the architect but the look of it doesn't excite him at all; maybe it's the one dimensional page, but he'd like to see a little more; something that stands out, but he is willing to accept residential.

Aldr. Stellato would agree to the PUD if the market analysis proves that, that would also answer the question of how much more retail can this site support-if at all, and how much more residential-if at all. He thinks everything we do going forward will be contingent upon some type

of market analysis, but if we go the PUD route he would still like to see the parking increase, density decreased and he would like to see an A, B, C and D-being a senior component with a community center for them and he understands if they need to combine a couple buildings to get that. He said that will really run in-line with what he thinks their market analysis will show because the demographics in this area probably support renters by choice of different ages, and he thinks that's one of them. He would like to see some type of timing or phasing analysis of when things would start and how long it would take; as far as giving variances on the PUD, the Committee would need to see some dynamic architecture and some different site plan layouts. He said he understands they just needed to put something together but he is assuming the site plan and the architecture will be more dynamic than this going forward.

Aldr. Lemke said based on what he has seen in the Comprehensive Plan and straight zoning it seems like we are seeking retail but are willing to allow something that's consistent with the plan and seems that the PUD is the more likely way to get that. He said it still looks like mostly residential and some veneer of retail outlots with predefined spaces; it just doesn't seem to allow for much retail expansion or retail flexibility, and if they believe retail will sell then he thinks we need to have something more than a predefined series of buildings out there. He would favor the PUD but the plan should have a mix, maybe starting with 20 acres of retail and the balance residential, he is not sure how the percentages would work out but suggest maybe having retail to the south and maybe a connector through the middle of that to differentiate in there. He said he supports some senior housing buildings, but then to bring the number of units down from the 600 to 700 that was already been rejected at a prior Council meeting and even then it was pretty overwhelming. He said there are some issues that need to be addressed by the petitioner should they decide to file an application that impacts the infrastructure, and he has seen developments that did not provide enough car spots per unit and there ended up being parked cars on through streets which will have an impact on surrounding properties. He said that number is easily addressable to meet the city's requirements without changing the look of the buildings, finishings or the appeal and he is surprised that the market doesn't show that empty nester couples would like this but don't drive. He said as far as impact, the application process includes the discussion of the impact on water supply, waste water and stormwater management, which is critical in that part of the city, as well as the electric grid. He said the scope of the work for any proposed traffic study should be known by Committee before the work is initiated, and the study should be independent. He likes the PUD and would like to see this move forward.

Chairman Bancroft thanked the developer for presenting the Concept Plan and for reengaging and he feels it's important to continue a dialogue and work together on it because we are in this together. He thinks everything he has heard from Committee, Plan Commission and the community was constructive and positive about moving forward, as long as the focus is kept on that, something will get done here. He thinks from a personal standpoint on comments, he points them in the direction of the January 6, 2016 memo that outlines the Plan Commission comments and he feels the Plan Commission meeting was particularly effective in terms of how they described the orienting of the development on a north/south basis to just their general comments; it was very helpful and they did a nice job of outlining it. He thinks a lot of the reaction the developer is getting is: we put a plan together that has a lot of residential units and no one threw us out of the building, and maybe that is defined as a win, but the bigger issue for the city is the community sense. He said it goes back to having a plan that sort of looks like a bunch of homogenous buildings; he is not worried about the parking, the professionals will tell us how much needs to be there; but really making it interesting to be a corner piece of that gateway is

crucial to getting something done. He said what the developer should take away from this is: People want to help you; they want it to be exciting, different and a valuable asset to the community. He said going back to the age restricted, he asks the question of focus, and he understands the strategy on a market basis of saying you want to appeal to the broadest audience possible, so here is 609 units and we think we can lease to everyone from 22-90 years old, then manage the market side on a scarcity or availability basis by phasing. And he thinks for this particular site, the developer is hearing a lot of questions regarding additional retail, and he personally feels the retail does follow residential and it is not dead; there is a place for retail here and he thinks in looking at a homogenous type of development, if we really dig down into that market study, it may change that to build more of a community to make it less of just a block of buildings. He encourages all of us to walk down that path together and thinks there's commitment on everybody's side to do so.

5. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS –None.

6. EXECUTIVE SESSION-None.

- Personnel 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(2), 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(5)
- Pending Litigation 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(4)
- Probable or Imminent Litigation 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(4)
- Property Acquisition 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(3)
- Collective Bargaining 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1)
- Review of Minutes of Executive Sessions 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(14)

7. ADDITIONAL ITEMS FROM MAYOR, COUNCIL, STAFF OR CITIZENS-NONE.

8. ADJOURNMENT – Alderman Turner made a motion to adjourn at 8:37pm. Seconded by Alderman Stellato. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion Carried. 8-0